K1T7TENF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 19 CR 696 (PAE) ARI TEMAN, 5 6 Defendant. JURY TRIAL 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. January 29, 2020 9 9:40 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. PAUL A. ENGELMAYER, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN, United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 KEDAR S. BHATIA EDWARD A. IMPERATORE 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 JOSEPH A. DIRUZZO, III JUSTIN GELFAND 20 Attorneys for Defendant 21 ALSO PRESENT: DANIEL ALESSANDRINO, NYPD WILLIAM MAGLIOCCO, Paralegal, USAO 22 23 24 25

(Trial resumed; jury not present) 1 2 (Time noted 9:42 a.m.; jury not present) 3 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. Mr. Smallman tells me the jury is here, and so I will bring them out into 4 5 the courtroom. I had an off-the-record conversation with 6 counsel earlier when I appeared. Nobody had anything to raise, 7 save that counsel noted a change in the handwriting on some of the more recent jury notes, and I will, at counsel's good 8 9 suggestion, remind them to have the foreperson initial each 10 note. 11 Does anyone have anything to raise before the jury 12 comes in? 13 MR. GELFAND: No, your Honor. 14 MR. BHATIA: No, your Honor. 15 (Time noted 9:44 a.m.; jury present). THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 16 17 Please be seated. All right. I will note for the record that all 12 members of our jury are here. I hope everyone had a 18 19 good evening and a good morning. You may now, with everyone 20 here, resume your deliberations. 21 One matter purely of housekeeping. I would ask just 22 for future notes from the jury that each of them be initialed 23 by your foreperson. 24 OK. Very good. With that, you may resume your

deliberations. I will see you at a later point. Thank you.

25

(Jury resumes their deliberations at 9:46 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right, counsel, be seated. As I mentioned yesterday, I have a multi-defendant conference this morning in one of the downstairs courtrooms. Mr. Smallman will be assisting me with that conference. My law clerk will be here in Mr. Smallman's sted. In the event we get a note, the CSO will notify my law clerk, we will share the note with you, and I will respond as soon as I can.

Steve our court reporter, who is assisting with this trial, will also be covering that conference, so we will be traveling as a pack back and forth as needed. I will need one person again from each team to stay close. My conference begins at 10:30. I don't know whether or not we will be called upon by our jury to do anything between now and then. See you soon.

(Time noted 10:33; jury not present).

THE COURT: All right. Be seated. Ladies and gentlemen, I have gotten a note which we're going to mark as jury note 8. It reads "Good morning. We the jury have reached a verdict," and it's signed by the foreperson number 2.

So, in a moment I will bring out the jury, and my practice is that I have Mr. Smallman take the verdict form from the foreperson; I review it just to make sure it is in form, in good order; and then I read aloud the verdict and ask the foreperson to confirm that that is in fact the jury's verdict.

Upon the request of any party, then I poll the jury to make sure that is in fact each member's verdict. Is there a request for me to poll the jury?

MR. DIRUZZO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, then we will do that.

Obviously I am in no position to know what the verdict will be, but my practice regardless is to meet with the jury to thank them for their service. When I do that I also will tell them that they are at liberty to speak with anybody they wish to, but they're not required to speak with anybody, and I tell them as well that they may wish to consider — if they are speaking about their experience with anybody — hesitating to share what other people said in the jury room other than themselves. In other words, it's one thing to talk about your own views, it's another thing to give up what other jurors said. It's up to them ultimately, but that's the guidance I give them.

I don't know whether or not the nature of the verdict will require us to have any further business together but, regardless, I will ask you all to stay. When I go visit the jury to thank them, I will then come back out and take care of what, if any, business remains.

Anything counsel wishes to raise before Mr. Smallman brings in the jury?

MR. BHATIA: No, your Honor.

1 MR. DIRUZZO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Smallman, let's bring in the jury.

MR. DIRUZZO: One thing, your Honor. I assume you would like counsel and the defendant to stand when you pronounce the verdict?

THE COURT: It's not necessary.

MR. DIRUZZO: OK.

(Time noted 10:37 a.m.; jury present)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, be seated. I have received a note which reads "Good morning. We the jury have reached a verdict," and it's signed by your foreperson. May I ask that the foreperson please hand to Mr. Smallman a copy of your signed verdict form.

All right. I have reviewed the verdict form, and it is in good order, and it has been signed by 12 people. Here is what I'm going to do. I'm going to read aloud the verdict form and then I will ask the foreperson whether this is in fact the jury's verdict. And I will expect -- I will read it, and you will let me know whether or not I have read it correctly.

After that, Mr. Smallman one by one will ask each member of the jury whether what I've read aloud is in fact the jury's verdict. So listen as I read aloud the verdict form so that you can answer his question.

After that, I will have some closing words of thanks

and excuse you, and then I will be pleased to spend a moment 1 with you in the jury room thanking you in person for your 2 3 service. 4 All right, with that, the jury's verdict is as 5 follows: 6 On Count one, charging bank fraud with respect to the 7 April 2019 checks: The jury's verdict is guilty. With respect to Count Two, charging bank fraud with 8 9 respect to the March 2019 checks: The jury's verdict is 10 quilty. 11 With respect to Count Three, charging wire fraud with 12 respect to the April 2019 checks: The jury's verdict is 13 quilty. 14 With respect to Count Four, charging wire fraud as to the March 2019 checks: The jury's verdict is guilty. 15 And following the verdict appear the signatures of 12 16 17 people. Juror 2, is that in fact the jury's verdict? 18 JUROR: Yes, it is, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Mr. Smallman, if you would kindly poll the jury. 22 DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 1, is that your verdict? 23 JUROR: Yes. 24 DEPURTY CLERK: Number two? 25 JUROR: Yes.

1	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 3?
2	JUROR: Yes.
3	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 4?
4	JUROR: Yes.
5	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 5?
6	JUROR: Yes.
7	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 6?
8	JUROR: Yes.
9	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 7?
10	JUROR: Yes.
11	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 8?
12	JUROR: Yes.
13	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 9?
14	JUROR: Yes.
15	DEPURTY CLERK: Juror 10?
16	JUROR: Yes.
17	DEPURTY CLERK: 11?
18	JUROR: Yes.
19	DEPURTY CLERK: And Juror 12?
20	JUROR: Yes.
21	DEPURTY CLERK: Thank you.
22	THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I am
23	about to excuse you, but I just want to take a moment and thank
24	you. One of the real honors of my job is being able to watch
25	at least in the detached way that I do jurors do their job

at least the public parts of their job. It was quite apparent to me that from Wednesday through today all of you have been really locked in and very, very focused on the awesome responsibility you have as jurors. I could tell that just from the level of attention you were paying during the trial, the active note taking, the active listening that was apparent on all of your faces, and the thoughtful detailed notes and the obvious intensity that you brought to your deliberations.

We are all blessed and fortunate to have members of the public serving as jurors like you, doing your job as conscientiously and sincerely as you did, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your service.

In a moment, what I'm going to do is ask you to go into the jury room, collect your things. I'm going to come in with the members of my staff so I can shake all of your hands and thank you for your service and answer any questions and get any feedback you have about your jury service.

So, with that, you have my thanks. I will see you in the jury room in just a moment. As I said at the beginning, with this you are now excused from your jury service. You will get a letter from me in the mail in short order thanking you formally for your service but as a result of this your jury duty is now complete. Thank you. I will see you in the jury room in a moment.

(Jury dismissed)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated. Counsel, I will be out in a few minutes to take care of the various things that one must take care of after a verdict of this nature. The items I have on my list to cover include the defendant's status between now and the date of sentencing, the date for any post-trial motions, a sentencing date, and then there is the outstanding issue of the grand jury subpoena.

There may be other issues we need to take up. To the extent counsel want to confer on any of those matters, this will be a good time to do that. When I come out I will take up those and any other issues that counsel wish to raise.

(Recess)

THE COURT: We're going to mark the jury's verdict form as juror note 9. All right. So, there are a number of issues to take up. Let's begin with a sentencing date and a motions date.

Defense, do you expect to be making post trial motions?

MR. DIRUZZO: Yes, your Honor, we anticipate a 29(c) and a motion for a new trial. We have asked counsel for the government if they would be amenable for a two-week extension from the normal time, that would be four weeks in total.

THE COURT: Just give me the proposal as to when you would like to submit your motion. You can expect me to be receptive.

K1T7TEN1

MR. DIRUZZO: Certainly, Judge. Today is the 29th, so February 26.

THE COURT: For your motion?

MR. DIRUZZO: For our post-trial motions, correct.

THE COURT: Government, when would you want to respond to that?

MR. BHATIA: We would request a month from that date, your Honor.

THE COURT: Four weeks from the 26th? So that would be March 25, correct?

MR. BHATIA: That's right.

THE COURT: All right. Defense, I'm happy to set that schedule. I don't think, knowing the case well as I do, that I will need a reply. I think after I read the motions, if there is something that I need further help on, I will commission a reply, but I'm not going to build a reply into the schedule and add to the work. I think I can be able to make an assessment in whatever direction based on the two motions, and if I need a reply, I will commission one.

MR. DIRUZZO: OK, Judge.

THE COURT: So, I'm happy to approve those dates.

All right. With respect to sentencing, I would envision a date approximately four months from now, counsel?

Any reason why there is some special problem here that should suggest something shorter? Defense counsel, I assume you are

not seeking an expedited sentencing date which would mean for going the draft PSR?

MR. DIRUZZO: Correct, we are not expediting, so four months would be perfectly fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: The norm in this district is about three and a half months, but given the need to resolve post-trial motions, it seems to me smart to add a couple weeks.

Counsel, how about June the 4th at 10 a.m.?

MR. BHATIA: That's good for the government.

MR. DIRUZZO: That's good for us.

THE COURT: Let's assume that is the date. Obviously, in the event there is some unexpected change of circumstance, I'm certainly open to moving that, but let's set sentencing down for June the 4th.

Defense submissions in connection with sentencing are due two weeks before sentencing, and the government's submission is due one week before sentencing.

Defense, you should arrange for any pretrial interview of your client by the probation department within the next two weeks and, government, you should get your offense version to the probation department within the next two weeks.

MR. BHATIA: We will.

THE COURT: So, having taken care of motions and sentencing, there is the issue of the defendant's continued release and the terms of that release pending sentencing.

1 Government?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BHATIA: Yes, your Honor. In this case we are seeking remand, and the reason for that is under 3143, your Honor, there is a presumption here at this stage of the proceeding, and of course the circumstances have changed quite a bit from before trial.

THE COURT: One moment. This is not, of course, the case under 3143 where detention is mandatory, correct? This is not like a heavy duty narcotics case or something like that.

MR. BHATIA: No.

THE COURT: So, refresh my memory, a post-trial presentencing in a nonmandatory case, what the standards now are.

MR. BHATIA: At this point, your Honor, the Court must find by clear and convincing evidence that the person is not likely to flee or pose a danger of safety to other persons or the community.

THE COURT: So clear and convincing applies both to the flight and danger provisions, and the burden is on the defendant.

MR. BHATIA: That's right.

THE COURT: And which are you invoking here in making that argument? Danger, flight, or both?

MR. BHATIA: Both, your Honor.

THE COURT: Explain.

25

MR. BHATIA: So, under a risk of flight, your Honor, 1 we have conferred with defense counsel about this. 2 3 understand it, the defendant does not have substantial assets 4 that could be used to secure a bond otherwise, and we think 5 that those also tend to show lack of ties to the community, 6 which goes to the risk of flight. 7 THE COURT: I'm sorry, let's slow down here. What are 8 the current terms of release? 9 MR. BHATIA: A \$25,000 bond cosigned by one 10 financially responsible person. 11 THE COURT: Who is that? 12 MR. BHATIA: I don't recall at this point, your Honor, 13 who the FRB is. 14 THE COURT: Who is it, defense counsel? 15 MR. GELFAND: An individual named Levi Herman. THE COURT: Who is that? 16 17 MR. GELFAND: A close friend of Mr. Teman's. 18 THE COURT: OK. Go ahead, government counsel. And 19 your concern is that the existing bond and Mr. Herman's 20 signature on it are not enough to insure the defendant's 21 presence? 22 MR. BHATIA: That's right, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: What has the defendant's presence been 24 like with pretrial supervision and appearance in court? 25 MR. BHATIA: The defendant has appeared in court and,

as we understand it, he has complied with the terms of his pretrial supervision, except we have noted for your Honor before trial and during trial the defendant's statements about the victims in this case, and the defendant made public statements disparaging witnesses in this case.

THE COURT: Right. But, look, there was no order in place directing him not to do that. It wasn't a smart decision but it wasn't against any rule or law. Once I directed him not to do that, did he comply?

Government? Once I directed him not to disparage the victims, are you aware of any noncompliance by the defendant?

MR. BHATIA: Not after that.

THE COURT: I am trying to understand -- look, I appreciate your views about the defendant, but what's the basis -- articulate for me why you think he is likely to flee?

I appreciate that the burden is on the defendant, but the burden is arguably met simply by the track record, which is that Mr. Teman has shown up; he has shown up despite of the distress that the note that we are all aware of reflected. The facts on the ground suggest that he is going to show up. Do you have his travel documents?

MR. BHATIA: I believe he has surrendered his passport, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: All right, you believe he has surrendered his travel documents. Is there any reason to think he has

1 asset

assets abroad?

MR. BHATIA: We don't, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any reason to believe he has any existing travel documents?

MR. BHATIA: No.

THE COURT: Is there any to believe he has friends or family abroad?

MR. BHATIA: I don't know one way or the other.

THE COURT: So, just articulate for me -- beyond the fact that he has now been convicted of this offense and that he is no fan of the customers whose testimony was presented against him, what's the reason to think he is not going to show up?

MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, at this point there is a substantial sentence, at least a guideline sentence — there is a possibility of a substantial sentence awaiting the defendant, your Honor, and so we think that is a substantially changed circumstance. And the defendant, as far as we know, doesn't have other financial ties that tie him to the United States, or that would require him to come to court, and so we think that at this point the defendant can't show by clear and convincing evidence that he will reappear.

THE COURT: What about the fact that he has shown up each time? I mean he was facing a substantial sentence. The evidence that you have offered is not different from what he

would have realistically expected.

You know, day in and day out he has been here. Why doesn't that clear the legal burden? I am asking you to explain to me why you're worried about Ari Teman not showing up.

MR. BHATIA: I think prior to trial the defendant had every expectation he would be acquitted, and I think the jury's verdict has changed that fact, and so I think at this point the possibility of a jail sentence has come into more stark relief.

THE COURT: Let me hear from defense counsel briefly on flight, and then we will turn to danger.

MR. DIRUZZO: Your Honor, we submit that Mr. Teman has always showed up; he has always complied. His compliance demonstrates, as your Honor has noted, that he is not a flight risk. It is true that Mr. Teman for better or worse does not have substantial assets. He is not that well healed, so to speak, so he can't give up as a security that which he does not have.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. I mean this is a very light bail package and the circumstances have changed. Part of my job is to tailor any bail package to the needs of assuring his appearance. Surely he has somebody else who has moral suasion over him than Mr. Herman. Are there other potential signatories here?

MR. DIRUZZO: With the Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: Does he have parents, that kind of thing? 1 MR. DIRUZZO: Your Honor, we believe that Mr. Teman's 2 3 college rabbi would be amenable to signing some type of bond to 4 ensure Mr. Teman's appearance between now and sentencing. 5 THE COURT: What? 6 MR. DIRUZZO: To ensure Mr. Teman's appearance, that 7 he doesn't leave. THE COURT: Look, my inclination would be to intensify 8 9 the conditions of release just to assure his appearance, and 10 I'm trying to work through with you what the tools are in the 11 tool box. 12 There is the possibility of electronic monitoring, and 13 there is the possibility of another cosigner. I think you're 14 representing to me that there is not a possibility of posting 15 any security because Mr. Teman apparently doesn't have money, 16 or so you represent. 17 MR. DIRUZZO: Yes, your Honor. But there is the 18 possibility that Mr. Teman's college rabbi would be willing to 19 sign. 20 THE COURT: We would need to obviously have the 21 government have access to him to determine whether there is 22 moral suasion, and if not that person there would be somebody 23 else. Does Mr. Teman have parents? 24 MR. DIRUZZO: Yes, he does.

THE COURT: Would they be in a position to cosign?

25

estranged from his family.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DIRUZZO: No, he has -- my understanding is he is

THE COURT: Where does his family live?

MR. DIRUZZO: Unfortunately, his parents -- most of his cousins live in the States but his parents do live in And he hasn't talked to them for an extended period of Israel. time.

THE COURT: Does he have siblings?

MR. DIRUZZO: I believe he has one sister, but he is also estranged from his sister and hasn't spoken to her in quite some time. He is not exactly sure of her whereabouts.

We would submit, your Honor, that the possibility of perhaps an electronic monitor would be sufficient to alleviate any concerns that the prosecution or the Court may have.

THE COURT: Government, what about a revised bail package that puts in place intensified pretrial supervision, essentially electronic monitoring effective immediately by pretrial and adding a cosigner to sign the PRB? The idea would then be if there is any slip-up, you will be right back in here seeking remand, but at least I'm going step by step and not jumping to the conclusion that Mr. Teman is not going to appear.

MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, I think an intermediary ground might be home detention with electronic monitoring. think that would allow the defendant -- that would allow to ensure the defendant appear for sentencing.

THE COURT: Where is the defendant's home?

MR. BHATIA: The defendant, as I understand it, lives in Florida.

THE COURT: So, you're proposing home detention with electronic monitoring?

MR. BHATIA: That's right.

THE COURT: And I take it with leave to attend to medical appointments and the like and otherwise as approved by the pretrial services -- by pretrial services?

MR. BHATIA: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. And what's your view about the addition of another signatory?

MR. BHATIA: I think an additional signatory would be appropriate. I think that makes sense. And if there were to be an additional signatory, then an increase in the bond value as well. Right now it's a \$25,000 bond.

THE COURT: All right. Defense counsel, I understood, Mr. DiRuzzo, you to be fine with electronic monitoring. Often that goes with home detention; that's part of what makes electronic monitoring effective.

Obviously, electronic monitoring permits the subject to attend to medical appointments, and if there is another carve-out or two that you need me to put on the record, I can, otherwise it's usually left to the discretion of pretrial

1 services. What's your view about that?

MR. DIRUZZO: Just for clarity, medical and mental health, the full ambit, but yes.

THE COURT: All right. But with those carve-outs you're fine with that?

MR. DIRUZZO: Yes.

THE COURT: I mean what I'm concerned about, to be honest -- based on the little exchange I've had with you -- is the level of estrangement that Mr. Teman has from people who are usually close to a defendant. It's a circumstance that raises a natural concern about rootlessness.

Can you tell me something about his roots? In other words, are their anchors in his life? He doesn't have any money. It sounds like his job, therefore, must be in some degree of perilous shape. The members of his immediate yet family don't speak to him. Help me out here.

MR. DIRUZZO: With the court's indulgence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, I just have one comment before you resume with defense counsel. My recollection is that Levy Herman might have been the individual who received the \$4,000 check, the bank deposit from the scheme, as we alleged in the case.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BHATIA: We wanted to flag that fact for your

Honor.

THE COURT: Duly flagged, but I'm not sure that changes anything. I mean --

MR. BHATIA: In addition, the fact that the defendant's parents are abroad also raises questions.

THE COURT: I am hearing you. I mean I am startled by the level of estrangement in the defendant's life, and that is a source of concern. I'm working through that with counsel to make sure that my outcome here is measured to the facts as they are emerging.

MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, just kind of backing up for a second, and just because we're on the record now I know that some of these brief at the time immaterial conversations had come out, but I have known Mr. Teman personally since freshman year of college. We have maintained a friendship since then. What I can represent is that he has built his own roots in New York and subsequently Florida — in the Southern District of Florida, to be precise. He was fairly sick several years ago. During that time period, your Honor, his parents, he was estranged from them, they didn't come to see him, they didn't come to help him in any way. There is no relationship there, and as a practical matter he has built kind of a family environment for himself.

There is an individual rabbi KLar -- K-l-a-r -- and that individual's family -- who unremarkable at the time but in

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

19

22

21

23 24

25

a remarkable way had showed up to watch portions of this trial and to support Mr. Teman. They are kind of where Mr. Teman tends to go -- when bond conditions were not at issue -- for religious holidays.

THE COURT: That's in New York? That person is a New Yorker?

Mr. Teman, just in your legal interests, let me hear through counsel.

MR. GELFAND: The sons live in Manhattan, your Honor. The parents live in West Orange.

THE COURT: If I have a home detention with electronic monitoring, will he be in Florida or New York?

MR. GELFAND: Florida, your Honor, in his Miami apartment.

THE COURT: How is Mr. Teman affording the travel back and forth to New York and whatever hotel or stay arrangement he had during and in connection with the trial?

MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, to be candid, he has exhausted most of his resources, and so, as I understand it, he had some money saved up that's basically exhausted. He has been able to borrow some additional funds to just kind of pay the expenses, as I understand it, your Honor.

As a practical matter, I mean he is not going anywhere. He has fully been engaged with his defense. to St. Louis, to my office, with the Court's permission several

weeks ago. I will represent, your Honor, something I have never done with any other client, he stayed at my house with my family. You know, he has known about the obvious possible consequences. Of course, we all hoped the verdict would come down a different way — that goes without saying in any trial — however, he is aware of the possible consequences, and obviously the process that the court will go through for sentencing. He has fully been engaged in his defense. He has been here every single time. He has been in regular contact with his pretrial services officer.

THE COURT: You're not aware of any breach of any condition of pretrial supervision.

MR. GELFAND: No, your Honor, I'm not. And on top of all of this there are pretty serious — as the Court is aware — mental health issues that are finally kind of under — as much as mental health conditions can ever be totally under control, they are under control in the sense that he has a team of people and it seems to be working. I mean candidly we've noticed a difference since the note that we are all aware of, and more common contact in the weeks leading up to trial, and I would like him to continue with that for everyone's benefit, including obviously his own but not limited to his own.

THE COURT: All right. Does anyone have anything else to add?

MR. BHATIA: No, your Honor.

MR. GELFAND: No.

THE COURT: I think it is actually a closer question than I had first appreciated, but in the end Mr. Teman's consistent compliance with the terms of pretrial supervision, coupled with the Draconian consequences to him were he not to comply, allows me by a narrow margin to conclude that he has met his burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that he is not a risk of flight.

That is contingent on certain conditions being imposed and subject to the conversation I'm about to have with the government about danger to the community. It seems to me to assure his appearance, I would make the following changes to the existing regimen.

Specifically, I will impose a condition of home detention with electronic monitoring, with leave of course to attend to medical and mental health appointments.

Second, I will ask that there be a second signatory to the existing \$25,000 personal recognizance bond.

Government counsel, I don't think the difference between \$25,000 and \$50,000 is consequential here. \$25,000 is still a lot of money, and somebody is not going to want to forego that. The central issue here is not between 25 and let us say \$50,000. It turns on whether the individual in question is somebody who has moral suasion over Mr. Teman so that Mr. Teman would not want that person to lose that amount of money.

So, I will add home detention with electronic monitoring, with carve-outs for medical and mental health appointments and otherwise as supervised by the probation department. And I will add the requirement of a second cosigner to the existing bond.

This is all contingent on my not being persuaded that there is a danger to the community.

Mr. Bhatia, you have an argument, I gather, you want to make as to that?

MR. BHATIA: Yes, your Honor. The danger to the community is with regard to the comments made about a victim as well as the comments made about the Court in the letter.

THE COURT: What comment did he make about the Court?

MR. BHATIA: There were comments in the note about the prosecutor and the Court. There is also the tweet that was right before trial.

THE COURT: The comments that I saw about the prosecutor were snarky and went to -- were jibes. Why is that a danger to the community? That's just juvenile speech.

MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, I think those are the facts we have, and I think on the defendant's burden I think it also contributes to the need for detention.

THE COURT: Is there any reason to think he is going to hurt somebody?

MR. BHATIA: No.

1 THE COURT: Is there a reason to think he is going to 2 defraud somebody? 3 MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, I think that's probably a 4 closer call. 5 THE COURT: That's the issue here. 6 MR. BHATIA: I think we are aware of instances where 7 we think the defendant has taken action against people who have sort of -- one moment, your Honor. 8 9 Your Honor, so I wanted to confer with Mr. Imperatore 10 for a moment. As we mentioned in our grand jury letter, we are aware of other conduct that we believe is fraudulent. 11 12 THE COURT: Right. 13 MR. BHATIA: So that does give us pause. 14 defendant -- also as we heard at trial -- has hundreds of GateGuard customers, and so that gives him access. 15 16 THE COURT: Why isn't the right answer to say -- to 17 add as a condition the defendant is not to create or deposit 18 any remotely created check and is not to draw on any other 19 person's credit card -- bill any other person's credit card 20 without the express written permission of the pretrial services 21 officer? 22 MR. BHATIA: I think that would be appropriate. 23 THE COURT: That should quard against the sort of

MR. BHATIA: I think that's right. And I think we

mischief one would naturally be worried about, right?

24

25

would also ask for no new lines of credit and some of the other standard bail conditions.

THE COURT: Mr. Gelfand, that sounds reasonable, doesn't it?

MR. GELFAND: Yes, your Honor, it does. To be blunt, obviously Mr. Teman is well aware of the possible consequences of --

THE COURT: I understand that. But, look, because he doesn't want the bail to be revoked pending sentencing, if I am explicit that a condition of bail is the ones I just mentioned -- including no remotely created checks -- that gives him an extra determinable incentive.

MR. GELFAND: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So what I am going to do is in addition to what I previous wrote is I'm going to write in the following:

"Defendant is not to create or deposit any remotely created check. Defendant is not to" -- help me, Mr. Gelfand, with the right formulation to the use of credit cards. He presumably has credit cards from other people. I don't want him to hit those. I want to come up with the right formulation.

Mr. Gelfand?

MR. GELFAND: I think the way to go is my understanding is that with some historic business transactions there is kind of an infrastructure of what we understand is agreed upon but, in any event, essentially recurring automatic

1 | credit card transactions.

What we would say is to give Mr. Teman a day or two to basically stop those from happening through I think it's PayPal or whatever the infrastructure is.

THE COURT: I am going to write "Defendant is to immediately terminate all auto pay" --

MR. GELFAND: And then we would ask that any such transactions be permissible upon written approval obtained between now and the time that the transaction occurs.

THE COURT: All right. "Defendant is to immediately terminate all auto pay credit card arrangements. Defendant" -- one moment -- "with him or any company" -- "any business with which he is affiliated."

I want to make it clear that this binds GateGuard and the other companies.

Mr. Gelfand, here is what I propose: "Defendant is not to create or deposit any remotely created check. Defendant is to immediately terminate all auto pay credit card arrangements with him or any business with which he is affiliated. Defendant may not invoice or bill any person or business without the written approval of his pretrial services officer."

It seems to me that that should protect against any potential fraud, while building in some flexibility and some ability to do business. But I am worried under the

circumstances here -- particularly given the financial need 1 that is evident on the face of this case, and is evidence on 2 3 the colloguy we've had -- I want to avoid any latitude --4 assuming compliance with these conditions -- to rip somebody off. 5 6 MR. GELFAND: One second, your Honor? 7 THE COURT: Yes. MR. GELFAND: I don't think this will move the needle 8 9 one way or the other, but there is just a very practical impact 10 on a word. Apparently PayPal's interface basically permits the 11 immediate suspension of any sort of auto pay, and what we would 12 ask is that he be ordered to immediately suspend, which 13 effectively --14 THE COURT: Why don't I say "suspend or terminate". 15 MR. GELFAND: Fair enough. 16 THE COURT: That's fine. 17 MR. GELFAND: And then could I request two unrelated 18 "Immediately suspend or terminate." One 19 THE COURT: 20 Go ahead. moment. 21 MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, these are unrelated to that 22 issue.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Are we done with danger to the community? Anyone have anything

THE COURT: All right. Let me just finish that issue.

23

24

25

else to add?

```
MR. BHATIA: Your Honor, on the bail, we wanted to get
1
      a representation from the defense, if possible, about the fact
 2
 3
      that Mr. Teman is only a United States citizen and does not
 4
      have any other travel documents. I wasn't a part of the case
5
      when the initial bail conditions were set, so I'm not familiar.
               THE COURT: Mr. Gelfand, I think that's a more than
6
 7
      fair question. Is your client only an American citizen?
               MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, my understanding is my
8
9
      client is only a U.S. citizen and that he has no travel
10
      documents other than the U.S. passport that was turned over.
11
               THE COURT: I am going to ask that to Mr. Teman.
12
               Mr. Teman, are you under oath. Do you understand
13
      that?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: If you make a false statement in response
      to what I am about to say, that could subject you to penalties
16
17
      of perjury.
18
               THE DEFENDANT: I understand.
19
               THE COURT: Are you a citizen of any country other
20
      than the United States?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: And have you surrender all of your travel
23
      documents including passports?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: OK, very good.
```

I think, Mr. Bhatia, that does the trick. With that then -- again, finding it a close call -- I do find that Mr.

Teman by clear and convincing evidence has shown me that subject to the rather muscular conditions I put in place he is not a danger to the community.

There is no basis other than speculation for me to assume that Mr. Teman could be a danger in any way other than in a financial or fraud way. There is no history. He hasn't been physically harming people or threatening people. I'm certainly aware that he has made provocative remarks to customers; he has engaged in juvenile speech; he has shown a vindictive streak, including a commentary about taking adverse action against people on days when they are deeply religious observant. None of this reflects well on him, but in the end none of it suggests an aptitude towards violence or anything like that. The real risk is that he would financially harm somebody. The conditions that I have read into the record a moment ago seems to me are sufficient safeguards against that conduct.

In the event there is a breach of any of those, Mr.

Teman, be aware strict rules apply. If you breach any of these conditions, you can expect the government to move for your remand, and you can expect me to be receptive to such an application. Do you understand that?

MR. GELFAND: Yes, Judge.

```
THE COURT: Mr. Teman, do you understand that?
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Government, anything further?
 4
               MR. BHATIA: Nothing further.
 5
               THE COURT: All right.
 6
               MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Two quick issues
 7
      that I would request the Court to include in its conditions.
               Number one, my understanding is that his mental health
8
9
      and medical providers -- and I think he had actually referenced
10
      this to you early on in this case -- they basically have him
11
      doing several mile walks outside on a daily basis. I would ask
12
      that he be permitted to continue that.
13
               THE COURT: Look, I've said defendant has leave to
14
      attend to medical and mental health appointments. I construe
15
      that to mean obligations that are ordered by such a
16
     professional.
17
               MR. GELFAND: OK. And then the other issue -- which I
      think is already embedded in the pretrial conditions -- is I
18
      don't know whether this will be necessary, but permission to
19
20
      travel if necessary to St. Louis to meet with me in preparation
21
      for sentencing.
22
               THE COURT: Why is that necessary?
23
               MR. GELFAND: It's probably not.
24
               THE COURT: Let's wait and see if it's necessary.
25
               MR. GELFAND: OK.
```

THE COURT: I'm not averse to it, but it's a different type of representation than in connection with trial. My guess is between phone, Skype and your existing bond of friendship and trust, you can probably get a lot done remotely, but I'm disinclined to needlessly do that. Right now the travel restrictions are presumably the Southern District of New York and the Southern District of Florida.

MR. GELFAND: That's fine. And if we need anything more --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Right now it's the Southern

District and Eastern Districts of New York -- which includes

our airports -- and the Southern District of Florida. If on an

ad hoc basis you need leave for him to come visit you, I am

certainly not inflexible.

MR. GELFAND: Understand.

THE COURT: Anything else with respect to bail?

MR. BHATIA: Nothing else.

THE COURT: Look, Mr. Teman, let me just speak to you directly. You know, you've got sentencing coming up in four plus months. How you behave, how you comply with the conditions of release, has potential consequences in terms of sentencing. It's an opportunity for you to demonstrate your ability to comply with the law, in particular the rules that I have set out as conditions of your release.

So, to begin with, if nothing else, your self interest

in making as good a presentation as you can in connection with sentencing should lead you to scrupulously comply with these conditions. Beyond that though there is the risk that if you don't comply, the government will move for your remand and I, if I find a breach, will grant that. That's the last place you want to be in. So, you are well advised to turn square corners here, and if you have any doubt about whether something is permissible, be in touch with your very able and dedicated counsel to guide you before you do something. Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sign this.

Anything else with respect to bail?

MR. BHATIA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, in terms of the cosigner, I have given a week to get the second cosigner. Defense, what you should do is arrange for the government to meet that person soon so we don't need to adjourn that date.

Government, your role here is to determine whether the person has moral suasion, whether they are an appropriate cosigner, whether there is a risk to them of losing the \$25,000. The fact that they may have had some business arrangement with the defendant may in some sense factor into the analysis. It's not clear to me that it makes the person less as opposed to a more suitable signatory. It would be surprising for a defendant to have a signatory with whom he had

K1T7TEN1

more detached -- more close ties -- and sometimes those include financial ones.

MR. BHATIA: Understood.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else I need to take up other than the grand jury subpoena?

MR. GELFAND: Logistically, just for within the Southern District of New York, as far as the ankle bracelet and things like that, where Mr. Teman has to go and when to get that? Florida?

THE COURT: I think he should report to pretrial right now, and they will guide him as to that. Pretrial is in 500 Pearl.

MR. GELFAND: OK.

THE COURT: Anything else other than the grand jury subpoena?

MR. BHATIA: No, your Honor.

MR. GELFAND: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, we stand adjourned as it relates to the criminal case. We are now going to create a separate transcript.

(Trial concluded)